REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-16, 18-33, and 46-50 are presented for examination. No further claims have been amended, added, or canceled.

Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al), U.S. Patent No. 6,742,043 (Moussa et al), and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,215 (Bakshi et al.).

Rabe-Hesketh discloses removing an email attachment and replacing the attachment with a link in the email. The link references the original attachment stored in a server available for later retrieval. Nonetheless, as correctly stated in the Office action, Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest formatting attachments based on a user's formatting preference.

Moussa is directed at reformatting and delivering a requested attachment based on information indicative of an email client's capability (Moussa, Col. 16, lines 28-31). The email client makes a request for an email along with information indicative of the email client's capability (Moussa, col. 16, lines 34-46). The email server reformats the email attachment and sends the email with the reformatted email attachment to the email client (Moussa, col. 16, lines 50-62). Nevertheless, Moussa does not disclose substituting a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

Bakshi discloses software a user uses to set download preferences (Bakshi, Fig. 3, Col. 7, lines 7-40). The download preferences are used to indicate a preference for transcoding by a network proxy that sends content to the network client (Bakshi, Col. 7, lines 19-28). These preferences are sent to a network proxy before the network client

requests content (Col. 7, line 55-61). This software is downloaded from a network proxy or transcoding server (Col. 8, lines 5-15). Thus, Bakshi discloses configuring a network client, setting transcode preferences for transcoding content and sending these to a network proxy, and then sending a request to download content.

Claim 1 recites:

> In an online messaging system supporting transmission of attachments, a method for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising:
> specifying a preference for formatting attachments that accompany e-mail messages;
> receiving a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment;
> detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message;
> responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the particular attachment as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, removing the particular attachment from the particular message, and inserting a link into the particular e-mail message, said link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the specified preferences;
> delivering the particular e-mail message to the intended recipient; and
> in response to invocation of the link by the intended recipient, receiving a request for a copy of the reformatted attachment, wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment.

(Claim 1) Claim 1 recites a request for a reformatted email attachment that "includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment." The Examiner correctly admits that neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa disclose "wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment." Instead, the Examiner relies on Bakshi as disclosing the missing element.

However, Bakshi discloses a two step procedure where the client sets parameters for downloading content, then requesting that content. Bakshi does not teach or suggest including the content transformation parameters in the request for the content. Therefore, Bakshi does not teach or suggest "wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment."

Thus, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests, "wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment" as recited in claim 1. Applicants' receiving a request is supported in Figure 6, block 601 and at Page 37, Lines 23 – 28.

Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2-25 that depend on claim 1 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.

Claim 26 recites:

> In an online system, a method for providing digital images to target devices, the method comprising:
> receiving an e-mail message having one or more attached objects;
> detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;
> responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, detaching said objects from said message;
> for each detached object, generating a reference allowing retrieval of a transformed copy of the detached object, wherein the generated reference includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment;
> automatically transforming copies of said objects to a resolution fidelity that is more useful to said target devices based on the transformation parameters; and
> delivering the e-mail message to the target devices, the e-mail message including said generated reference for each detached object.

(Claim 26). For the same reasons as discussed in claim 1, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests "wherein the generated reference includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment". Therefore, claim 26 and claims 27-33 that depend on claim 26 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.

Claim 46 recites:

> An e-mail system for providing e-mail having attachments, the system comprising:
> an e-mail server for:
> receiving a particular e-mail message having an attachment, the particular e-mail message being addressed to a recipient having a target device capable of receiving e-mail, the attachment including one or more objects, and
> detecting capabilities of the target device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;
> a transformation module for transforming the objects of the attachment to a desired format, based on capabilities of the target device; and
> an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at least one reference responsive to detecting the target device and responsive to identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device, wherein the at least one reference allows retrieval of at least one of the transformed objects and the at least one reference includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the at least one of the transformed objects;
> a retrieval module allowing retrieval of the transformed objects, in response to invocation of at least one reference.

(Claim 46). For the same reasons as discussed in claim 1, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests "and the at least one reference includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the at least one of the transformed objects." Therefore, claim 46 and claims 47-50 that depend on claim 46 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: December 17, 2008

Eric S. Replogle
Reg. No. 52,161

Customer No. 08791
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300